

## Remarks

Claims 1-15 are now pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 6, and 8-13 and added claims 14 and 15 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Applicants have amended the title to more accurately reflect the claimed invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,991,802 to Allard et al. in view of U.S. patent publication 2002/0059282 to Andersson et al. The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allard et al. in view of Andersson et al. and further in view of U.S. patent publication 2001/0042081 to MacFarlane et al. The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allard et al. in view of Andersson et al. and further in view of U.S. patent publication 2002/0143822 to Brid et al.

The combination of Allard et al. and Andersson et al. does not suggest the claimed invention since, among other things, the combination does not suggest a way to access a resource or a method without having to place the address of that resource in the URL. According to the claimed invention, the current address or interface for a resource is held by an aspect. This avoids updates and repeated updates to URL's already made available. According to the claimed invention, the function is named but is not present. Rather, the Aspect Object has to query the Aspect in order to obtain an interface to the function.

On the other hand, Allard et al. suggests that one or more functions are present in the URL. A script invokes, or carries out, the function or functions. According to Allard et al., the script instantiates an object class determined by the URL in the received request and the requested function together. Along these lines, at col. 4, lines 1-3, Allard et al. states, "The shim script retrieves from the request an indication of an object class and a method of the object class to invoke."

However these functions are carried out differently according to the claimed invention. Along these lines, the software application identifies in a request an Aspect Object and Aspect from the URL, and queries the Aspect Object to obtain an interface for the Aspect that will provide the desired function. The URL does not include the access to the function, the interface to the Aspect that carries out the function, and the resource suggested by Allard et al. Rather, according to the claimed invention the URL includes the Aspect Object and the Aspect.

According to the claimed invention the URL does not contain the resource, because it does not contain the actual address or in other words, the interface, to the Aspect. One further step is provided by the invention, which is to query the Aspect Object to find the interface for that Aspect, and thus then to obtain the resource. Then, the function may be invoked by using the interface returned, as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner cites col. 6, lines 65-67, of Allard et al. as suggesting "implementing the function of the identified object," and, "invoking the functionality of the object by means of the

reference". However, Allard et al. does not suggest invoking functionality of the Aspect utilizing the reference provided to Aspect indirectly by Aspect System Object." Rather, Allard et al. only suggests a generalized result of "invoking the function identified in the URL."

On the other hand, Andersson et al. addresses the problem that a conventional object-oriented system, "requires that an object in a computerized system has prior information about an application in order for the object to, for example, access a method implemented by the application." This is a different problem that is solved by the claimed invention.

With respect to the "contextual information" recited in the claims, pages 8-9 of the specification describe how the presentation unit 26 sends a request comprising a URL with the purpose of getting access to such an Aspect. Page 9 describes an example of an Aspect representing a faceplate of the pump that Aspect Object 3 represents. The characteristics of the presentation unit are found by sending a response message to the presentation unit. The response message is adapted to contextual information, which describes characteristics of the presentation unit. The presentation unit is updated with the result of the performed function of the real-world object. The contextual information is provided by the software application, which is not the same as how the contextual information is provided in the HTTP request of Allard et al.

Applicants submit it would not be obvious to combine Allard et al. and Andersson et al. For example, Allard et al. and Andersson relate to different technical fields. Along these lines, Allard et al. suggests industrial control systems and Andersson suggests object oriented data processing. Also, Allard et al. does not suggest a need to provide a further level of indirection in

order to identify and obtain an interface for a function or method. Additionally, Allard et al. does not address the problem stated by Andersson that a computerized system requires, "prior information about an application in order for the object to, for example, access a method". Furthermore, Allard et al. does not suggest the kind of problems or challenges that Andersson et al. asserts industrial control systems need to overcome, as described in paragraph 0003. Additionally, it is not a case of simply combining Allard et al. and Andersson in order to obtain different names for the items "object class" and "object". The Aspect Object and the aspect are not the same thing as object class and object.

In view of the above, the combination of Allard et al. and Andersson et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-13. Accordingly, the invention recited in claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-13 is not obvious in view of the combination of Allard et al. and Andersson et al. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Allard et al., Andersson et al. and MacFarlane et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 6 since, among other things, MacFarlane et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Allard et al. or Andersson et al. For example, MacFarlane et al. does not suggest a way to access a resource or a method without having to place the address of that resource in the URL. The Examiner only cited MacFarlane et al. as suggesting a web server response message is adapted according to extensible markup language. This does not suggest the aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Allard et al. and Andersson et al.

Therefore, the combination of Allard et al., Andersson et al. and MacFarlane et al. does

not suggest the invention recited in claim 6. Accordingly, the invention recited in claim 6 is not obvious in view of the combination of Allard et al., Andersson et al. and MacFarlane et al. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Allard et al., Andersson et al. and Brid et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 9 since, among other things, Brid et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Allard et al. or Andersson et al. For example, Brid et al. does not suggest a way to access a resource or a method without having to place the address of that resource in the URL. The Examiner only cited Brid et al. as suggesting a web browser installed on a wireless device. This does not suggest the aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Allard et al. and Andersson et al.

Therefore, the combination of Allard et al., Andersson et al. and Brid et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 9. Accordingly, the invention recited in claim 9 is not obvious in view of the combination of Allard et al., Andersson et al. and Brid et al. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited references and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based on the cited references.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 25, 2009

/Eric J. Franklin/  
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134  
Attorney for Applicant  
Venable LLP  
575 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: 202-344-4936  
Facsimile: 202-344-8300